

**ICANN  
Transcription  
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) PDP Working Group call  
Wednesday, 17 January 2018 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-17jan18-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p1h65rtitg/>

Attendance is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/tqxyB>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms, RPM, and all GTLD PDP working group call held on the 17th of January 2018.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll calls. We have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room.

Currently at this time on audio only, we have Brian Beckham. In addition to Brian, is anyone else on the telephone only? Hearing no further names, I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I'll turn it back over to our Co-chair, J. Scott Evans. Please begin.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much, Terri. Good evening, good afternoon, good morning, everyone, depending on your location. This is J. Scott Evans for the record. I will be chairing today's call.

And just to remind everyone, it was covered in the memo that sent out with our agenda by Mary but to remind you all, there will be no call on January 24th due to staff obligations on an internal meeting we have to have which will make them unavailable even in the evening time.

We've thought about moving our Asia Pacific call but it turns out the staff obligations go well into the evening so we would have no staff support. So, I just want to put that on for the record.

Excuse me. At this time, I think it is appropriate just to check in really quick to see if anyone has an update to the statement of interest.

Okay. Hearing none, as you can see, the agenda is posted in the pod or window to the right-hand side of the Adobe Connect and we are going to start today with a presentation on the information, the data that's been collected and updated on URS cases that's been put together by staff, particularly Berry has put this together for us.

And so, I'm going to turn it over to Berry for his presentation and then once that's finished, we'll continue on the agenda. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, J. Scott. Welcome, everybody. I'm just going to run through the PDF that you see in Adobe Connect room. This was also sent along with the agenda last night and this is the continuation of pretty much the same presentation that's heard in Abu Dhabi.

The different between this version and the prior version is that it first contains data to the conclusion of 2017. Also - it also contains changes due to some feedback from that session (copy) as well.

So, I'm just going to run through pretty much each page. I'll pause for a second after the second pages on down to see if there are any questions and we'll get through this and then be able to continue on the agenda.

So, starting on Page 1, this particular page really hasn't changed from the first version. This is still just a general graph and table of the TLDs that were delated over each of the last years up till now.

It hasn't changed because since the last presentation, there hasn't been any other new gTLDs or gTLDs from the 2012 round that has been delegated.

And it's really just per use with reference and to put in the context of the state of the activity and the deployment of the new gTLDs.

I'm going to move on down now to Page 2 which gets in to the URS definition, the resource documents, when the three providers were announced to start conducting URS case reviews.

And the really two takeaways from this page are down towards the bottom under data set characteristics. First is the scope which is bullet number two. As I mentioned, this now includes data from to the conclusion of 2017. The prior version had halted at the June 30 of 2017.

However, there are 12 cases at the time that I collected the raw data from the provider sites that were still in pending status. So, it's technically not all data of cases concluded in 2017 and it just depends on whether these 12 were finally wrapped up at the end of 2017 or if the decision date if it falls into January of 2018 and that's when they'll be picked up.

I suspect that the next time we go through to up this data will be closer - well, it will be on two different aspects. One, if the working group feels they need a refresh data set. But most specifically, I suspect we'll refresh this data as we get closer to publishing an initial report or something along those lines.

And again, just like the first version, the third bulleted item, there are a few cases that are for other TLDs not associated with the 2012 round. Those

cases because they were completed are included in the raw data set but they do not - they are filtered out from any of the actual numbers or charts that we are presented here.

Moving on to page 3, first table is just the high-level table of all the URS cases. Essentially, there are 827 cases now across 1,861 domains.

There is a title in the first table that's supposed to say 2.25 or 2.25 average domains per case with still a median of 1. That was an error due to the track changes within the Word document. When we post - repost this to the Wiki, I'll make sure that that typo is corrected.

The second table is just a distribution of the cases by provider. I believe that there were one or two from the ADNDRC.

There were - most of the bulk of changes for the last half of 2017 were with forum and I believe that there were no changes from MFSD. In short, they were really for the last half of 2017 just shy of 80 total cases that were new into this data set.

And I'll stop right here. J. Scott, please go ahead.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I have a question with regard to the data characteristics bullet point three. You mentioned that there - these cases that you've listed here are included in the cumulative data.

But my question is how did a dot pro or dot cn have a URS applied against it since these only apply to new TLDs that were delegated during the round? Is that - do - I see when you say withdrawn, I see that that was mistakenly down.

But for dot pro, I see two cases, one was suspended and one was denied. So, I'm just - and then for dot pw, did they sign up to - voluntarily to be included in the URS? Are these just aberrations?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, J. Scott. For the dot cn and dot pw TLDs, I can't confirm when they contracted amongst that country code TLD to provide services. But they are included in the raw data that are presented on the provider sites.

The dot com one was withdrawn I believe as there's an error because there was another domain that was associated with it. As for dot pro, if you recall and I don't remember the exact date but the dot pro registry agreement was renegotiated with ICANN that does now include the URS capability within that agreement that occurred sometime in early 2017.

And once those occurred, there were two cases that were filed for the dot pro TLD, one of which resulted in a suspension and then the other case was denied. The reasoning for them being filtered out is I think our scope for - scope one URS review is only for typically the 2012 round or the new gTLDs and hence why they're filtered out of our steps below.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Right. Great. Okay.

J. Scott Evans: We're on Page 4.

Berry Cobb: Yes. We'll be moving on to Page 4 which is just Table 3 Chart 2. This - I think the biggest change from the prior version which is really an oversight on my part but when we're looking at the raw data that has been scraped from the provider sites, it is by cases and there are cases that do have multiple domains.

When we - when I imported that data into my current spreadsheet, I actually created it on a per domain level and not on a per case level because we wanted to extract statistics about the domains themselves regardless of whether they were included with other domains in that review.

There was a feedback that we got from Abu Dhabi that it was much more meaningful to have these tables and charts but together on a case basis and thus this is just a different version of the kind of the same data set but is now just by cases.

And the takeaway here is just to see the number of cases that were filed or commenced per year. The main takeaway here is you'll see that there is a downward trend from the quantity of cases filed in 2014 to what that we see now in 2017.

And again understand that small caveat that there could be at least 12 more added to this 2017 number depending on what the end result of those cases will be and whenever we do - go to update this data set as I mentioned earlier, you know, the 2017 number is slightly going to change. But the other takeaway again is that clearly for them there's the predominant provider here.

Okay. I'll move along to Page 5, this is a very busy page with more charts and I'm hopeful that most of this group has had time to read this in detail. But it's very important to look at the notes or the paragraph above these two tables.

The original intent of this - from the first version, the original intent was to show the number of domains per TLD that showed up within cases. And so, the first change that you're seeing here is that now we're actually looking at this by the number of cases and the table to the left versus the number of domains which is the table to the right.

The secondary change here is that there was feedback in Abu Dhabi as well to understand if commencement date of the URS case actually fell within the trademark claims window as defined by the registry.

And so that is now this attempt. So, as listed in the note as an example just looking at XYZ, there were total of 69 cases filed for XYZ domains. Only two of those 69 showed up within their defined trademark claims window.

And then looking at it at the detail of domains, there were only - which is to the table to the right, there were total of 582 domains within those 69 cases. Only two of those domains actually showed up within their defined 90 days trademark claims window.

So, the intent was to try to get an idea of when the commencement date occurred within their defined windows. However, I think that this table should probably or at least it would be my recommendation it's up to the working group.

It doesn't serve the intents of truly understanding of whether a claims notification actually resulted in either a URS or UDRP. And technically, we're really trying to go back to some of the prior deliberations under the stream or the path of talking about the trademark claims and sunrise and that component.

So, what staff is working on is to get a fresh data set from IBM which will show when a claims notification was sent for a particular TLD. And then as part of the technical specification, when a domain is actually registered after the claim is presented, it will also in that logging showed that the particular second-level domain was indeed registered.

So, when we get a fresh data set from IBM, I'll be able to go back and look at the actual domains that were registered and then I can go back and compare

that domain list with the domains identified in these URS cases and we'll be able to get to a specific number.

Staff made the decision here to go ahead and present this data because it was asked by the working group. Again, just to close out, I would suggest that we do away with this chart and look to better find the path that I just discussed to get to that definitive number instead of this.

And so, probably a future version. We still have these two tables but it will just be a single column or, well, there will be two columns by TLD, the number of cases by TLD, the number of domains and move on from there.

Any questions or comments before I move on from this page? I know it's a pretty crowded or noisy type of table to understand.

Okay. Moving along now which I believe will become Page 7, which Table 6 and eventually Chart 3. This is going to be even more complicated than the prior charts or tables is because this is a compilation from the prior version of this document that was three or four tables and charts.

And based on feedback from not only the co-chairs in reviewing this but out across a few comments in Abu Dhabi, it was difficult to compare basically the outcome type with the actual determination. And so, the idea was to consolidate this into - in one master table and charts.

I'll quickly just point to you on the next page on Page \* is kind of a visual representation of what the table displays on Page 7. And what you'll see here, Column 1 is essentially kind of titled as Category with the top-level row being kind of the outcome type.

And then there's subcategories behind that or below it which are the determination type. So, for example, if the domain was suspended then there

was a determination type of either default, final, or a combination of default and final and I'll talk about that in a little bit detail in a minute.

But essentially, you have primary categories, secondary categories of the determination type as you move down. And then the columns to the right that are in white and gray are basically subtotals as you roll up these numbers.

And what's behind this is basically creating what Microsoft Excel calls pivot tables and I think I mentioned this in Abu Dhabi as kind of a poor man's version of the relational database and that's what pivot tables provide you to analyze rows and columns of various data sets in an attempt to make meaning of them.

So, we kept Column A or Column 1 the same exact results where the subcategory tags as what you would find in the charts. And then on the left column is an attempt to make a more detailed description of what the subcategories actually mean.

I won't go through all of these in detail but I will provide an example. So, we'll just start at the top which is suspended and default.

So, essentially, the takeaway for this area or for this subcategory under domains that were suspended and had a default determination, there were 531 cases that had a default suspension. And then there's a breakout in the columns to the left that the grand total is by provider.

Of those 531 cases, one of those were appealed based on that original default determination. And then, again, over to the right is just the kind of an attempt to further explain what each one of those rows means.

If we were to step down into the final subcategory, there were 178 cases that had an outcome where the domain was extended. But what's different from

the default is that the registrant had responded to that case. And of those hundred 178, 10 of those were appealed.

And I just like to point out that on both of these subcategories, default or final, there's this indication of blank and the reason why that is showing up is because in the raw data, there is no data in that field and thus the pivot table will default mark this blank note of indication.

But at the end of the day, when you're - when you see a row where it has the blank in here is that this basically means 168 of these domains that were suspended still had a final determination of - final determination, meaning that the registrant did respond and that there was no appeal from that. Whereas conversely, the row before it is that there were 10 appeals of domains that did - still have a final determination.

And then lastly, within the subcategory is the default/final. Within the - I believe it's the procedures, the examiner has the option to publish both outcomes of that particular case.

And Mary or staff can correct me if I mess this up but in general, if the cases filed there's a default determination, at some point, the registrant does respond and then eventually through that response is still a final determination, the examiner is making the choice to publish both of those on the provider site.

And the details of that can be found within the URS procedures. But essentially, from - and I believe, yes, all of these are from forum, 14 of those cases resulted in this default/final.

And essentially, if you were to click on the links for each one of those, they present themselves as they're the same case number but when you look at the URL they have a different letter denoting the difference between the default version versus the final version where the registrant had responded.

So, I won't spend much more time on these but again, you can see that there's a subsection for where the claims were denied. There was a subsection where there is a split decision, which means that there was a final determination on a case, it was appealed, that appeal resulted in a split decision. And then the last section is the complaint withdrawn.

And I'll just scroll down to back or scroll down to what is Page 8, which again is just a visual representation of the previous chart and then we then also attached definitions for the outcome types and the determination types and that basically flows over to the bottom or to the top of Page 9.

And then I'll just conclude and turn this back over to you, J. Scott, the very last table is just a gauge of the average duration from the commencement date to the decision date by provider with a total average of 17.39 days.

So, happy to answer any questions. There's concerns about how this data is presented and certainly look forward to any other suggestions on this data. Thank you, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Berry. I'm in the queue first and I see Susan Payne and Kathy Kleiman. I wonder if it might not be easier if rather than leaving blank since blank, as I understood your explanation, indicates that there was no appeal filed that rather than just leaving it blank you put no appeal.

So, you got no appeal in one category - one subcategory and appeal in another category. I'm wondering if that might assist in alleviating some of the confusion. Berry, I see your hand is up.

Berry Cobb: Yes. Thank you, J. Scott. Mary had the exact same feedback and I resisted. But, you know, at the end, I'll change based on the working group's feedback.

So, the reason I was hesitant to do exactly what you just said and why we added this last column of description is because if I were - for example, under suspended default and I can't tell if it's synched or not but I'm back on the table on Page 7.

If I were to go back and say no appeal and exchange no appeal with the term blank there, for me, to remove that in the graph, which is presented on Page 8, I've got to go change the actual raw data and I didn't want to do that because I'm trying to stay true to the raw data that is presented on the provider site and thus why we created the description column.

So, for that blank row of 530 cases, it's a default determination, i.e., without a response or an appeal. And so, it is truly up to the working group how you think this is best to present it but the rationale again was just to not modify the raw authoritative data from the providers.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, Berry. I see Susan Payne and then Kathy Kleiman.

Susan Payne: Yes. Thanks, Berry. It's Susan. It's just a really question about the final table which - I'm sorry, hang on. Sorry about that.

The final table which is the one about the duration. It's just a really quick question. Does that - if there wasn't appeal, does that include the time the cases - does that include the time taken to get to appeal the cases where there was an appeal or is it just time (to get) decision?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Susan. I'm going to have to come back with you for an authoritative answer to that. Right now, all I have is what is provided from the data scraped off of the provider sites, which basically has the commencement date and the decision date.

There's so very few many appeals in the grand scheme of the 827 cases. My instinct would say that if it's not included that these duration to averages

wouldn't change much. But I will take the action to go back and just confirm just to make sure that we're squared up on that.

Susan Payne: Okay. Thanks. And, yes, I guess as you say maybe it's unlikely to make a significant difference to the average. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Susan. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, J. Scott. This is Kathy Kleiman. Can you hear me?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Great. Berry, first, thank you for all the work you put in into this table and to listening to comments in Abu Dhabi and then coming back. I really appreciate.

First, some procedural things and then I have a more substitute question. One is you keep referring to page numbers. I just want to let you know, I printed it out and I'm looking at it on the screen, I don't see any page numbers.

So, it might be a good idea to out page numbers in but in the meantime, if you could refer to the title of the chart that you're talking about, it would certainly help me follow you through the discussion especially if we're going to, you know, have questions and jump around.

Looking at what I think is Page 7, the chart title is Table 6, Chart 3, I wanted to ask you about default determinations. It would be worth dropping a footnote here to 6.3 of the URS procedure that says all default cases proceed to examination for review on the merits of the claim.

So, these aren't automatic losses and as we'll see even in default lower down in the chart, even when there's default cases, sometimes their decision is in favor of the registrant, which is really interesting.

My question for you has to do with the next section of the URS rules and where those are reflected in the chart. So, 6.4, the URS procedure says, if after examination in default cases. So, if after examination in cases where the registrant has not shown off often probably because they don't notice but other reasons as well, the examiner rules in favor of the complainant, registrant shall have the right to seek relief from default via de novo review, not an appeal but de novo review by filing response at any time of the six months after the date of the notice of default.

So, I'm wondering how many registrants did that? How many filed within six months after default via the de novo review? Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Kathy. I'm going to attempt to answer this but I will lean on Mary and other staff to correct me if I'm wrong is looking at this data, first, I don't believe again and this is only as scraped off of the search pages from the provider's site, I don't believe that this necessarily will specifically state which aspect of these cases contain the de novo review as you mentioned in the URS rules.

However, the fact that the way this information is presented on the provider's site is that if there's a final determination or an appeal or the default final and through any of these numbers means that there was some sort of response in general by the registrant.

I think that to understand exactly whether the registrant responded within the 14 days or after the 14 days and up to six months or if they tried to make an extension from that first six months that will require a review of those individual cases themselves where there was some sort of final determination or appeal as tagged from the data.

From this particular data set, I don't think we'll get to that kind of level of granularity. And I'm going to turn it over to Mary to hopefully correct me if I messed up.

Kathy Kleiman: All right. So, Berry, you're saying it's not available, that the decisions aren't saying whether it was - whether the registrant responded but responded in the longer window.

Berry Cobb: Hi, Kathy. Just before I turn it to Mary, no, I'm not saying that. I'm just saying the way that the data is presented off of the search pages that basically will show all of the cases on the provider's site, it does not believe that if we were to go look at the actual individual cases and click on the links and reviewed the case that we could make a determination whether it was a response within the 14 days or the de novo review before six months.

And then we could - if we were to review the individual cases, we could add this to the data set and then get those rolled up but it's not automatically presented by the providers for the way that you're looking for.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thank you very much, Berry. And just one editorial comment that's going on in the - this is J. Scott for the record, in the - as George pointed out and I backed up, I believe it's safe to assume that there were at least 14 cases, Kathy, where that has occurred because in a case where both the default decision and the final decision was published by the examiner, it's an assumption but I think it's safe to assume that they got a default judgment and then they responded after that so that would be outside the 14 days and within the six months. So, we know at least in 14.

But if they didn't publish both, it would be included in that number up there or in the appeals number and we would know unless - but I think we can assume that at least 14 times it occurred.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Mary, I'm going to jump to you and then I'm going to go to Zak.

Mary Wong: Thanks, J. Scott, and I just raised my hand from staff to back up what Berry had said that the data that we got is categorized as you see it. So, it's categorized by really the nature of the determination and the result.

And so, the nature of the determination is whether it was a default determination, meaning there was no response filed before the termination was made or a final determination which means a response was filed at some point or an appeal decision.

So, we go to the final determination category. That's what Berry was saying that when we look at the cases themselves, we can see the dates when these filed, the responses that is, and from there, we can derive whether or not those responses were filed within the 14-day window, after the 14-day window with or without an extension.

But the data itself as categorized at the moment does not show that. So, hopefully, that underscores what Berry says. Thanks, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Mary. I'm going to move to Zak Muscovitch who has raised his hand.

Zak Muscovitch: Thank you. Zak Muscovitch. Just to reiterate what Kathy had mentioned, this is a tremendously helpful chart and data which you provided, Berry.

I wanted to ask about one aspect of it. Since the chart for Table 6 is supposed to itemize and tabulate results from URS, should it also include one of the alternative results which is an abusive complaint where a complaint where the panel was found - found that the party need a material falsehood?

And I understand that the results were called from the provider's websites and when I ran that result on NAF, I saw that that there were no results that had that finding. But nevertheless, it is a data point that if there were zero findings that may be an indication that all of the complaints even ones that were denied were meritorious or it might be that the panels didn't accurately make that finding and was improperly considered.

So, I think it's another data point which we could include in the chart even if it's currently based upon the grand total of 827 cases, there were zero such findings. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Zak. I going to go to Mary Wong who's hand is up again.

Mary Wong: Thank you, J. Scott. Thank you, Zak, and now it's my turn to ask Berry to correct me if I get it wrong. Again, this is something that on the phase of the data we could not tell and therefore, without going further either to request the information from the providers if they have it or by looking at the phase of the case report itself we did not have.

But it can be derived because if you look at a lot of the cases and as George printed out in the notes, it is not a great deal that many cases necessarily that you can find that the examiners do generally note whether or not there was indeed that kind of material falsehood or abuse.

So, by looking at the phase of the case, that is one way to derive the information but it is not the information based on the data that we were able to get at this point.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Mary. Are there any further questions for Berry regarding this information that we see provided here?

Zak Muscovitch: J. Scott just Evans, would I be able just to follow up on that with Mary?

J. Scott Evans: Is that Zak?

Zak Muscovitch: Zak Muscovitch.

J. Scott Evans: Certainly.

Zak Muscovitch: Thank you so much. So, when I looked at the NAF website which has the system for searching cases by inputting various parameters, one of them for the URS was abusive complaints.

And so, if you tick that box, you can actually get a result of apparently how many URS cases had the finding of abuse in them. And so, the result came out as zero from that.

So, it seems to be a data set that isn't readily available without actually reviewing the cases themselves and it's a data point that is independent of whether or not such finding should or should not have been made. It's just a factual number apparently of zero assuming that the system properly tracked those - track that criteria. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Zak. I think I see Berry's hand is up.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, J. Scott. Just to respond to Zak, you're right. But what I'm going to do is I'm just going to quickly share my screen. I think in the first version of this, I tried to provide a PDF of the raw data.

So, when we're pulling this data and I know that this will probably be difficult for you to see in detail, but essentially when we pulled the data from the

provider's site, we're just doing a search for all of the data to get to all of the cases that exist out there and there's only a limited amount of data that is presented in that and thus that we're seeing the scrape and I've also added to the data set.

So, for instance, way over here in Column A is all of the cases by forum. The case number, case name and disputed domain names are fields that would be presented.

To get to the "By The TLD", I would - I had to split apart all of the domain names and then extract that outer text to column to get to the "Just The TLD."

And the whole idea is to split this apart again so that it shows up or that I can produce these pivot tables to make (the sense). What I have listed here which would be the outcome type and the determination are provided from the provider's site.

The commencement date and decision date show up in that query at least for forum. For the other two providers, they would only provide the commencement date. Fortunately, there wasn't a whole bunch of those.

So, I went in to each decision or each case to pull out the decision date where one existed. And then, of course, from there, then I start to extract out, you know, what's the commencement year, what's the duration and those are calculations in the spreadsheet so that I can then roll that up.

In terms of going through and searching the provider's sites for this abuse mechanism that you're mentioning, I think that in general, we probably need to understand from the working group what are all of those different specific asks and if not doing it through the URS case review or asks by staff going out to the provider's sites or thirdly asking the providers to provide that information, let's get that set-up criteria that we need to extract from these cases and then we can either add it to this data set or bring in a secondary

data set so that we have better visibility into these issues that you're looking for. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Berry. Any further questions, thoughts, concerns? Claudio.

Claudio Di Gangi: Thank you. So, my question was just whether if additional issues come up, is staff available to do additional research? I know Rebecca offered to do some but I was just curious, you know, is staff able to continue to help us out with getting data. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Mary?

Mary Wong: Thanks, J. Scott, and thanks, Claudio, for the question and I note for the record for those who are not in the Adobe that, Claudio, I think this follows up on the question you had in the chat as transparency whether the data collection is a one-time exercise or is that something that can be ongoing.

And as I think everyone knows, we don't currently have a mechanism where we collect information in any uniform, standardized way across all the providers on an ongoing basis.

So, as I noted in the chat, this is something the working group may wish to consider whether it's for the URS or any other of the RPMs that you may be considering in this PDP to have that done not just on a regular basis but done in a consistent and uniform manner so that you're not having to reinvent the wheel, you know, the next time a review like this comes along.

To respond to your follow-up question, there are, of course, with bandwidth and resource capacity. So, what's Scott is working on with the co-chairs and Rebecca has been part of that discussion as well. So, the refresher that she is doing is the type of research and review of the data that we currently have of the cases that you might consider something you want to study, how best to do that, who would be best place to do that. And as Berry mentioned

earlier, what would be the kinds of fields or reporting elements that should be extracted from that kind of research and review of the data that would be of most use to the working group.

So, it's under discussion but if you or the working group have suggestions on how that can be done, who might be best placed to do it and specifically what is the type of fields or elements that you would like to see, I think that would be very helpful to the discussion. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much, Mary. I appreciate that information. Man, you can see that - I think the whole idea, this is a working process and there may be things that find, that we need additional points on but we do have to take in to account that there are bandwidth issues on staff. And so, we need to be very cognizant of that.

That's not - in other words, what I'm trying to say is, yes, there's additional research that can be done. The question is should it be done given staff resources, timeline that the way it affects our timeline to come to our decision and thus - and provide a report and those kinds of things will all have to be brought in as we consider.

Hopefully, we'll make a broad enough past on this as we go. I think with regards to Zak's point, it - as I understand from reading the chat, it may not be this type of information is easily searchable and (scrapable) from each provider site. That does not mean that that is an interesting point that needs to be explored when we look at the cases.

And so, we may want to actually look at those cases and put that as a field of consideration. But just because it's not in this table does mean necessarily that it is a point that will not be considered in the final analysis.

So, that - I hear no more question. I see no more hands. Let me scroll just to make - Susan Payne is raising her hand.

Susan Payne: All right. I know it's early phase to making recommendations and things, but I mean, it seems a reasonable one that we could kind of agree and capture now that or at least that, you know, if people think it's a reasonable thing to recommend.

You know, Mary's made a couple of comments about the lack of standardized data coming from the providers. And obviously, that could be sort of, you know, implications and difficulties and providers providing the data in standard form. But we could presumably make recommendation that we think ICANN should explore with the providers gathering the data on URS cases in a standard form so that, you know, the future review or easier to conduct.

I mean, could we - could we consider making that - you know, capturing that recommendation now as something we think is worth making?

J. Scott Evans: I certainly see no reason why we can't, Susan. Is there anyone else that would like to speak to this point? George?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the transcript. Yes. I've been advocating exactly that for, you know, at least a decade now with regards to the (EDRP) and of the data - applies to the URS. The community can come up with the standard XML format for publication of decisions that would have all the relevant fields and the providers would be expected to publish in that format. So, it's not hard but it needs to be the policy requirement in order get them in line. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I am seeing general agreement with that. So, if we could note that in our notes that it appears that the recommendation - one of the recommendations that we'd feel like we should make at the end of this process is with regards to at least at this stage, the URS that there should be standardized reports developed and that each provider should have to provide in a standardized format so that as George pointed out, we're getting

the same information from everyone and that makes it easy for researchers to look at the data and make sure we're getting the same data.

Okay. George is making the point in the chat that he's not just talking about a standardized report, he's also talking about how the decisions are formatted and he sees them in an XML format because that would make it easier to actually work with the data.

Okay. Now, any more comments? Okay.

So, now on our agenda, what we have here is we need to look at the questions. The reason we jumped ahead, just as a point of explanation is because Berry is not available on the 30 - on the 31st to provide this information. So, we want to go ahead and get this report in front of you because it's - this type of data, along with the case review that we're going to be doing that is going to inform or be the data that we looked to to answer the questions with regards to the URS.

But what we have to do, we agreed amongst the working group was that the standardized question that were listed at page one of our methodology report would be up for discussion and we need to decide on a set of questions that we believe that we're going to put towards all of these. We would look at the data that would ask these questions with regards to each high-level topics.

Susan Payne, I see your hand is up again.

Susan Payne: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to - I posted an e-mail to the list but it was only shortly before this call. And so, you may well not had seen it for which I apologize.

But when I read the agenda, it seems to me that last - on our last call, we didn't actually finished the discussion of the co-chair statement which is

attached further down in this document. We started the discussion of it last time and we didn't finish that discussion.

So, I don't mind if we go back to that now or if we do it after we've considered the questions, but I would like to flag that I think we haven't finished that.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much. And I do not believe we consider that discussion to be closed. I was - I think we were just trying to loop back and finish out this and then we can go.

I'll leave it to the working group as to how they wish to proceed. Do you all want to continue one with the flushing out in the next 34 minutes these standardized questions and see if we can come up with that or would you prefer to go and finish out our discussion on the co-chair memo?

If you'll let me know - let's - those that would like to - yes, it's not closed, Susan, I see. And you notice Phil was in agreement with that as well. We will have a thorough discussion of that.

But I just made the point to my co-chairs that we have made a big promise to this group that we would consider these questions and we had not gotten to that. And so, I thought it was appropriate that we go through the questions, Okay?

So, I look to these questions here. You see that there are five. I'd pick any comments. I'll go first.

I don't think question five is a good question. I mean, I think that - I just - I don't think that that's how many manage to prevail was not necessarily - I mean, it could be that they manage to prevail all for the wrong reasons. So, I don't think a metric about how many prevailed is important or should come in to our analysis at all.

So, I would strike question five altogether and not include it in any form. I see, Mary, your hand is up.

Mary Wong: Yes, J. Scott. Mary from staff here. Just to this specific question, this was included in the high-level questions or the standardized questions for the simple reason that it was suggested during the working group call where the idea of having standardized questions was discussed and it was also suggested within the context, actually, of one of the more specific charter questions.

So, while staff included this as question five in the high-level questions, because it was suggested within the timing of that call, it was also suggested within the context of a specific charter question, so it may well be that this particular question could only apply to some or a few of the topics but not all that's in contrast with the other four which will all suggest that as a series of specific high-level questions.

Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much. I see Rebecca's hand has come up. Rebecca?

Rebecca Tushnet: Hi, Rebecca Tushnet. I think this is a basic data-gathering question. I don't - I don't really understand why if we're asking has this been used, we wouldn't want to know and what happens when it was used if we want to reword it to, you know, what happened. But it's probably counting is literally the only thing we're going to be able to agree on. So, I don't see why we wouldn't actually try and do that. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, Rebecca. I think I'm a little - personally - this is J. Scott - I'm a little confused. I had talked about question five. I'm not - and you mentioned question one. I know there's some discussion going in the chat box about question one but I'm a little confused. Are you talking to question five and my comments about how many in the manage to prevail or...

Rebecca Tushnet: It's Rebecca. Sorry. Please finish.

J. Scott Evans: Go ahead.

Rebecca Tushnet: Yes. So, I understood question five to be sort of what happened with whatever we're talking about, you know. Did people prevail with their complaints? Did people prevail with their response or their defense or whatever?

And if you want to say that's a subset of has it been used, we certainly can. But I don't - I guess I don't understand why we'd get rid of it. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Well, then - this is J. Scott Evans for the record. Then perhaps, it should say rather than how many prevailed given the fact that there could be different variants of what a prevail is, would a better question be what was the ultimate outcome? Any thoughts?

I'm seeing some agreement in the chat. Is there anybody who disagrees with question five being - and what was the ultimate outcome?

George?

George Kirikos: George Kirikos here. It might be helpful for people to open up two different windows, like, page one of the document so they can see the five questions. And then scroll the rest of the document to see various issues.

I don't see how even this new question would apply to many of these topics, to be honest. So, I'm just puzzled. Like, obviously, the original question doesn't apply to many of these topics but even this modified one argue - talk about prevailing with regards to, for example, education or evaluation of the URS providers and things like that.

So, unless you only want to apply the question to a subset of the topic. But that kind of - it raises the question whether it should be, let's say, a column that's orthogonal to these issues at all. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much, George.

So, that's the reason we need to consider this. And it may be that the five - all five questions wouldn't be applied to each topic. It may be that, you know, one or two questions would apply depending on what the particular topic is. So, I just drew things out. So, let's just put a placeholder to get the discussions started that it looks like where it would be relevant, the better question for five would be what was the ultimate outcome.

So, with regards to the other questions, I think George makes a good point. We need to look at the type of standard questions that we might ask about. I mean, I think this is from my personal opinion. I'm not so sure.

I think has it been used, if there's been a response filed and a complaint filed, it answers itself. But that may be a very good question with regards to defenses.

So, I mean, I'm just thinking we need to - we've got to think about this and how we want to structure this and it's to the group to help guide this. And so, I look to you and I think Rebecca's point is well taken that when she said, well, there may be subsets to questions under, has it been used?

But we just need to decide, you know, on a set of questions and it can be that we have, let's say we ultimately decide that there are going to be eight questions and not each question would be asked against every point, every upper topic but they are the eight questions we'd ask. We might ask question one, five, and three of certain topics. Four, two, and six against others. One through seven, giving others depending if they are appropriate.

But I need some guidance and we, as co-chairs, need guidance from the working group about how they'd like to proceed and what questions they feel are valuable to ask against these topics in a way that is content-neutral objective and allows us to look at the data both at Berry's putting together and the cases and extrapolate answers to those questions based on the data that we have in front of us.

So, that's the purpose of this exercise. We have 25 minutes left. Any comments? Kathy? And then Claudio.

Kathy Kleiman: Thank you, Scott. This is Kathy and you've seen this in the chat. So, let's put it out.

So, for question number one, has it been used? The follow-up and we've done it in any number of data, subteams and dataset. Has it been used? If not, why not?

You know, these things are created. It's a new, you know, URS is a new system. If something's not being used, why not? It will give us a better idea of, you know, whether things are understood, whether they're not understood, whether they're superfluous.

So, again, it's on the table. It's on the chat. Has it been used? If not, why not? Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Are there others - Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: So, I agree with that and also what George put in the chat about two, three, and four being sort of correlated to each other. And when we say original purpose, I'm presuming we mean the original purpose of the provision within the URS, not the URS as a mechanism.

And if that's the case, I think, J. Scott, the way you described it is, I think we need to be flexible and decide which questions would be applicable to the topics and, you know, I think they do capture most of the issues we're going to be examining.

My question was, in particular, when we say are we making a presumption that the original purpose of a specific provision is valid or is it possible that (in live) experience, there was something baked in to the URS that we now realize that should be modified in some way and I just wanted to make sure that was captured.

My concern is that if we proceed on the basis that all of the original provisions within the URS that there are some sort of presumption that those should remain, I don't think that's necessarily correct. I think it's possible that we might want to change some of the provisions within the URS. So, I just wanted to make sure that was captured. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thanks very much, Claudio.

So, thank very much Claudio. So, Corwin, I think I see your hand next.

Phil Corwin: Yes. Thanks, J. Scott.

Phil, for the record. Personal comments. I just would say that in applying these questions and whether we have five or seven or eight or whatever, that we just should acknowledge that they're going to have to be selectively and kind of flexibly applied to the different questions below on the table.

So, for example, when you ask has it been used in some cases, that's going to be very easy to answer. If you're talking about the duration of suspension period, you said, yes. And every case where there was a suspension, it was for the remainder of the original registration period that's taken as granted whereas in under D1 standard of proof, has it been used?

Well, we hope it's been used but without a, you know, some further inquiry as to the actual determination of URS cases. We can't be sure that it's been used in all cases and that (shade of gray) cases have gotten through.

Similarly, asking how it hasn't been used doesn't apply at all for something like point number one under remedies whether there should be additional remedies such as a perpetual block that would - the consideration of those remedies would stem more from the questions regarding whether there's been unintended consequences of just - of only have suspension as a remedy and whether adding other things would better align the proposed additional remedies with the original purpose and intent.

So, I'm just saying, you know, we're going to - it's great to have an overarching kind of question framework for the more detailed policy questions if we just all the knowledge that in some cases the answers...

J. Scott Evans: You're right there?

Phil Corwin: Yes. I'm still here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Phil Corwin: Well, just to reiterate, the point in some cases, the question will be very applicable to one of those policy inquiries. In some cases, it's not going to be relevant.

In some cases, the answer is going to be very can be very easy to find. In other cases, it's going to -- my poor left ear. And finally, in some cases, questions like has it been used won't apply at all to suggestions for new remedies or other new features of URS.

So, I'll stop there. I hope - if we can just agree on flexible and selective application of these overarching questions, I think, will be able to work with them. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Great. Thank you, Phil. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I just got a few. I want to respond to Phil's point. I'd be happy to listen because I was going to - go on to something more deep.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I mean, I think - I mean, I don't - I think he made the same point that I made earlier which was that it may be that all - not every one of these questions is apropos to every one of the high-level topics. And we need to decide, when we look at a topic, which of those questions we believe are apropos.

We're going - I think George has pointed out in the chat that questions two, three, and four seem to be aligned that they could be asked against. And, George, correct me if I'm wrong, they could be asked against most of the high-level topics. What was the original purpose and is it being fulfilled?

Keeping in mind or bearing any intended consequences and what changes could better align the mechanism if the answer to question three is, yes, there had been unintended consequences, what changes could better align the mechanism with the original purpose or facilitate and carry out its purpose? In other words, that would be a recommendation, I think.

So, if George is going to respond to what I pointed out from the chat, if that's Okay, Kathy, I'd like to go to him first and then I'll come back to you.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. I'll stay in the queue. Thanks.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos again for the transcript. Yes. If you look at two, three, and four, yes, as you've said, consistent with one another. If you look at question

number two, in particular, it's a compound question. It does - it asks what was the original purpose. That's a question.

And then conceivably, you could break it out into a separate question. Is it being fulfilled. And so that could kind of reorder the column, per se, if we consider these to be columns and then all the issues to be rows in a table.

And then, if you look at number one, I think Rebecca made a good point earlier about, perhaps, rephrasing that and one suggestion is, as I pointed out earlier is, do we have data or experience on this topic and that could kind of go into right after the first part of number two. So, what was the original purpose and then do we have data or experience on this topic? And so that's kind of a data collection exercise.

And then if you look at the second part of the current number two, is it being fulfilled? And that's based on, obviously, the data or the experience of that process. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, George. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. I had a question for you and Heather, who I understand are the drafters of these.

On what you meant by regional purpose? As you pointed out and as George pointed out, it's three different questions, two, three and four. And how, you know, what was the original purpose?

Maybe in the eye of the beholder on some of this, as a person on the (SCI) drafting team, I thought the original purpose was creating fear and balanced procedures for trademark owners and registrants to handle clear-cut cases of abuse and the new gTLDs unexpedited basis.

But it sounds like something - especially if it's the questions that we should think about how we're going to address. And so, I wanted to know what you were thinking of and what perhaps are saying of the original purpose and how, together, working could provide that a - that kind of a broader definition especially for putting in to three questions. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. This is J. Scott Evans for the record.

First of all, I didn't draft any of this. I saw it the first day the rest of you did. I was on the call in November when this was discussed. And as Mary has pointed out, the five questions were merely extrapolated from the discussions that occurred during the call when this methodology first came up as an example.

They were given as an example of how they would do in a way that they thought would ease the burden of our work without having to go through each charter question and wordsmith it. So, I think that that was - she made those questions on the fly that's been said over and over again. So, I think what we're trying to do now is decide whether those questions that came up on the fly are appropriate or as we give them a more thoughtful look at it after we've adapted and decided we've adopted and decided we like this methodology, what questions -- keeping in mind the general concept -- are appropriate?

So, that's the purpose of this exercise. It's not to defend any of these questions, it's to ask the group if they consider them, if they believe they're appropriate or if they do not believe they're appropriate. If they believe that there are other questions or different questions that need to be on put forth.

Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Terrific. I appreciate - it's not an accusation. I just thought I saw Mary's notes of several references to the fact that you and Heather had drafted this. So, if that's not the case, that's great.

And it looks like Heather's in the chat talking about what she might have meant by original purpose. But I think it's something we have to dive into so that we don't wind up with original purpose having different meanings.

Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Susan Payne.

Susan Payne: Yes. Hi. I mean, we've got a chart in which we could have all just go back and look at. I did try to put it in the chat but I'm afraid it came out horribly formatted.

But I mean, it's in the background section and it talks about, you know, as the result of the details of these programs so when you write technical mechanisms were developed to mitigate potential risks (linked off) to trademark holders that could arise in the expansion of the detail in this name space included certain (stake offs) to protect registrants to getting the (just with) uses of domain names.

I mean, isn't that the legitimate purpose? I mean, this was meant to - this was meant to be a process that stopped this, you know, painstakingly wordsmithing the individual charter questions so that we can just get on that and do the job we're here for. We just go around in circles every week. This is so frustrating.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Susan. Any other - as I - this is J. Scott Evans speaking for the record.

As I look at these questions, I don't think that question five, no matter how it's worded, applies to everything. I don't think question one, as it currently written even with an if not, why not sub question applies to everything.

I do think -- I agree with George -- that two, three, and four seem to have alignment and they seem to align together. I think that we could use question one in certain areas and we can agree on it when we get there.

Like I've said before, I perfectly agree that defenses may be a question, that that would be appropriate for. Appeals might be one that's appropriate and could be used.

With regards to remedies, the extension of the suspension has it been used is another one that I think has it been used applies to. So, I think that those are ones that would apply in certain instances. I think two, three, four apply.

Now, we - when we look at something and we ask the question what was the original purpose, it may be that part of this process is we have to come to a group and decide what that original purpose was. Right? We have to say, based on the discussion, we extrapolate, we look at the (RRT) report, we looked at the (SITI) report. We believe the original purpose was X.

Applying that to this, here's that question. You know, and I don't think it's - Kathy, you went way up to the original purpose of what the URS is. I think this is much more granular. What was the original purpose of allowing there to be a six months window for someone to be able to come up and bring an action after default? What was the original purpose of their being allowed a year for there to be an appeal?

Those are the kinds of questions, I think, we're asking about the mechanics of it and why it works - why it was written the way it was and is that fulfilling its purpose? Right? So, that's the - that's sort of how I see it rather than asking the question with regards to the URS.

I'm talking about looking at those topics and how they are and the issues that are under those topics and asking those questions to it. I'm just trying to explain the methodology so that we know how these need to be do.

Let's go Claudio and then we'll go to Paul McGrady.

Claudio DiGangi: Thanks. Thanks, J. Scott. And I agree with your interpretation there. My only comment was if we are looking at the original purposes, let's say question number three, for example, and we find that there have been some unintended consequences, question four seems to just bring us back to the original purpose again. It says what changes could better align the mechanism? What the original purpose facilitated it to carry out its purpose?

So, I'm just a little unclear that when we find - if there is any unintended consequences, does question four - is question four drafted in a way that allows us to basically say we need to make certain changes to the policy and we might have to deviate from the original purpose. Maybe that's just another question that we could add or modify question four in some way.

And just looking at it, it just seems that there's a presumption made that the original purpose is sort of valid and we shouldn't be straying from it. That was really my only point. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Claudio. So, I see that - this is J. Scott Evans for the record. Perhaps a question we ask is the original purpose still relevant? So, something in that line. And maybe that's the sub question we get to when we ask these questions. I don't know. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks, J. Scott. Paul McGrady for the record.

So, I think just to recap what we've talked about. I think one will be answered in two. What was the original purpose and (unintelligible). So, I'll use an example of the one year for appeal. If we're (getting back answers) but the original purpose was to provide a reasonable amount of time for an appeal but it's not being fulfilled because it actually takes two years, not a year, to do an appeal.

Then, you know, question number one may be answered because it actually takes two years, nobody could do it in one year, then nobody will have appealed. Right? So, I think one will come out in the wash.

Five, if modified, what were the ultimate outcomes? Again, I think that there's sort of two kinds of outcomes. One is what was intended by the original purpose and I don't think anybody - Claudio has raised an issue about the legitimacy of the original purpose. I'm not sure that, you know, we have a lot of time and stomach to go back and take too much of a look at that. But maybe some do.

But I think most of the time, we'll say, Okay, if it sort of worked itself out in the way that the drafter has intended, fine. But if it didn't work itself out in the way that drafter's intended and there's an unintended consequence and that sort of answers the question about what were the ultimate outcomes, right?

So, five, I think, is - I think we can scrap one and five because they work themselves out in two, three, and four. I think that leaves us with what was the original purpose and is it being fulfilled, bearing in mind the original purpose, have there been any unintended consequences, what changes could be better aligned - could better align the mechanisms with the original purpose, facilitate it to carry out its purpose and then the next question would be if the original purpose is still relevant. And if not, what should be the purpose of the mechanism and should the mechanism be retained or refined? Something along those lines.

And then I think we have a very sharp tool here to go through and evaluate these and that will allow us to move forward. I, you know, there's been some chatter in the chat about frustration. I actually think that this back and forth in the conversation has led us to a pretty good point of taking these initial strawman questions and I hate to use that word because it's so loaded in ICANN land.

But taking these initial drafts and really coming to, I think some good thoughts about the purpose, the relevancy of the purpose, whether or not the purposes are being fulfilled, and any kind of wackadoodle outcomes because we should be worried about those. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Paul. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I actually think I'm understanding the five questions a lot better. So, with the modification, I think one and five actually do contribute a lot. And the original purpose is applied to the mechanism's mechanics, we're looking at everything in the abstract.

But, J. Scott, what you said about playing into the mechanics, with the response, the complaint, the appeal, that also makes a lot of sense. So, I think the five questions as drafted, you know, with the modifications we discussed today, actually makes sense.

And I just wanted to add, of course, we're still keeping light of the charter questions. They're kind of in a deep background but they're were kind of drove the creation of the URS review topics and these high-level questions.

So, they're still there as well, you know, kind of prodding us on some specific issues that were of concern to people when they were drafting the charter. So, I think the five questions makes sense. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Anyone else? Okay. We've got about three minutes left. So, so far, what - I haven't heard Susan Payne.

Susan Payne: Yes. Just quickly. Just noting what Kathy just said and the status of the original charter questions. Can we just have a note, please, to the effect that we all acknowledge the original charter questions are horribly biased in the drafting and that we've decided not to go through an exercise of redrafting

them painstakingly, that we recognize that, so that we lace it down the line, the staff referring back to them or saying that some topics are out of scope because they're not specifically captured in a particularly biased draft charter question.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. Antoinette? I'm sorry. You just dropped - you came up to the top of the list. I see your hand is not up. Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes. Thanks, J. Scott. I'll be brief in the interest of time.

You know, following up on Susan, I think, you know, we can get some agreement on these top-level questions, then we can, hopefully, free up a lot of time we might spend arguing over the precise wording of the charter questions for, example, on G1, how can the appeals process of the URS be expanded and improved.

That kind of presumes that there needs to be expansion and improvement if we just say we're going to address the appeals process and look at how it's been used and whether it's being used and, you know, to achieve the original purpose and whether it is an unintended consequence.

We could save a lot - we could all agree that we're not kind of freed up from endless back and forth about modifying that question and we're just going to focus on the appeal process and how it's working, is it achievable? Did things pop up we didn't expect? We can save an awful lot of time that would otherwise be expanded on endless back and forth about precise wording of these questions. So, I hope we can do so. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. So, where I see us now and I've just - I want to summarize it for the record, this is J. Scott Evans, is that we - while there's some that think one and five may not be applicable to everything, there are those that believe that they have value. So, one through five,

I do believe I heard both Claudio and Paul suggest that we might want to ask another question and I would suggest that it comes between - it'd be inserted between current questions three and four and that is, you ask the question had there been any unintended quant consequences and then we have a question with regards to whether the original purpose is still relevant.

And if the answer is yes or no, then you move to we could modify what changes could better align the mechanisms of the original purpose or to carry out this purpose or should there be a new purpose, you know? Something in that way so we leave our way to say that, you know, that we - that, you know, there should be a new purpose of we realize, you know, there should be changes, we capture that that's also something that we can do.

We've got - we're right at the hour. So, I'm going to - Jeff has not spoken at all. So, I'm going to go to Jeff and then quickly Kathy and I'll let you close us out.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks. This is Jeff and I haven't spoken. But on this one, I think it's very dangerous to talk about if the original purpose is still relevant because then we're going to get - my fears will get backtracked into an argument of whether intellectual property rights deserve to be protected at all versus free speech and - let's use some caution, let's stick with these five and then think value a little bit more as to whether we think about whether the original purpose is still relevant because we can go down a big rat hole. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: I see Kathy agrees with that. Kathy?

Kathy Keliman: I was in the queue too and (go with) Jeff Neuman's rule that we don't go too far afield from, you know - if there's no problem, we don't rewrite things. So, I'm in agreement with Jeff. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Paul says he's flexible. So, I'd say, at this point what I'm hearing the greatest amount of agreement on his we just keep the five questions as they are. I

think Rebecca has asked in the chat if in one we could ask the why or why not. So, hasn't been used if not why not. You know, we can, some form of that question in one.

So, I would ask that staff do us a favor of recirculating this but breaking out these questions with any suggestions that they sift through the minutes and can advise that we need - that have been suggested we make. We put those to the group on the list and we solve this on the list.

And so, by the time we come back, we have two weeks. By the time we come back on the 31st, we've resolved the issues with regards to those questions and we can move on to dealing with data gathering so that then we can look at the data, apply these questions to it, look at the - each high level area, move on with our work.

So, one more time. The 31st will be the Asia Pacific call and that will be circulated to everyone and so you'll know that as well.

And with that, I'm going to thank everyone today for their participation. I think we made great progress and I appreciate everyone for their thoughts and we look forward to speaking to you in two weeks.

Man: Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned.

END